



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/574,637	05/18/2000	John J. Johnson IV	30603UT1002	8108
5179	7590	09/22/2004	EXAMINER	
PEACOCK MYERS AND ADAMS P C			HWU, DAVIS D	
P O BOX 26927			ART UNIT	
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 871256927			PAPER NUMBER	

3752

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/574,637

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON, JOHN J.

Examiner

Davis Hwu

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 41-45, 48-55, 57-71 and 73-113 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 41-45, 48-55, 57-71 and 73-113 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment of August 27, 2004 is acknowledged and entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 41, 43, 50, 52, 57-59, 93, 95, 98, 101, 103, 107-110, and 113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik. Kincheloe discloses a vehicle comprising a triangular wheel base comprising a single front wheel and two opposing rear wheels, a vehicle engine, a wedge shaped nose, and at least one window. The patent to Pestotnik teaches a three wheeled fire-fighting vehicle comprising an emergency response fluid delivery tank to fight fires in remote forest locations. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe by providing an emergency response fluid delivery tank as taught by Pestotnik to be able to fight fires in remote locations of a forest. The vehicle sizes and weight as recited in claim 59 are obvious matters of design choice since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size and weight of a component, which is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.
4. Claims 44 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik as applied to claims 41 and 93 above, and further in view of Bolton et al.

Art Unit: 3752

Bolton et al. teach providing fire resistant windows to vehicles for fire protection. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe and Pestotnik by providing a fire resistant window as taught by Bolton et al. for fire protection.

5. Claims 45 and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik as applied to claims 41 and 93 above, and further in view of Atkins.

Atkins teaches a vehicle having a chain and sprocket steering system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated into the vehicle of Kincheloe and Pestotnik a chain and sprocket steering system as taught by Atkins since Atkins teaches that such arrangements are known to one of ordinary skill in the art and the vehicle of Kincheloe and Pestotnik would function properly with such arrangements.

6. Claims 48 and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik as applied to claims 41 and 93 above, and further in view of Arnold.

Arnold teaches a vehicle comprising a steering system which provides a 360 degree rotatability about an axis substantially orthogonal to the axis of rotation of the wheels for translational movement of the vehicle (Column 5, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe and Pestotnik by providing a 360 degree

rotatability for the front wheel as taught by Arnold for translational movement of the vehicle.

7. Claims 51 and 102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik as applied to claims 41 and 93 above, and further in view of Carrier.

Carrier teaches a fire fighting vehicle having a tank with fire-retarding chemicals which is capable of producing at least 34,000 liters of fire-suppressing foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Kincheloe and Pestotnik by providing enough chemicals in order to produce at least 34,000 liters of foam as taught by Carrier in order to provide adequate amounts of fire fighting foam.

8. Claims 53 and 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik as applied to claims 41 and 93 above, and further in view of Forsyth.

Forsyth teaches a fire fighting vehicle which is capable of being airlifted to a destination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Kincheloe and Pestotnik. by providing at least one attachment point for airlifting and airdropping the vehicle as taught by Forsyth in order to quickly place the vehicle a particular location to fight fires.

9. Claims 54 and 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik as applied to claims 41 and 93 above, and further in view of Willard, Jr.

Willard, Jr. teaches a run-flat tire which demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and yet achieves the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe and Pestotnik by using runflat tires as taught by Willard, Jr. in order to provide demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and achieve the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated.

10. Claims 55 and 106 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik as applied to claims 41 and 93 above, and further in view of Matsushita.

Matsushita teaches a vehicle steering control system comprising left and right brakes and control valves for separately controlling the left and right brakes in order to obtain smooth turning performance. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe and Pestotnik by incorporating left and right brakes wherein the brakes are separately controlled as taught by Matsushita in order to provide a smooth turning performance.

11. Claims 42, 49, 94 and 100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik as applied to claims 41 and 93 above, and further in view of Fuller.

Fuller teaches a fire fighting vehicle comprising a frame 12 supporting a removable tank 16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe and Pestotnik by

Art Unit: 3752

providing the recited limitations such the tank is removable from the vehicle since this concept is taught by Fuller in order to clean or replace the tank as necessary.

12. Claims 60, 62, 66, 68, 73-75, and 111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Arnold.

Kincheloe discloses a vehicle comprising a triangular wheel base comprising a single front wheel and two opposing rear wheels, a vehicle engine, a wedge shaped nose, and at least one window. Pestotnik teaches a three wheeled fire-fighting vehicle comprising an emergency response fluid delivery tank to fight fires in remote forest locations and Arnold teaches a vehicle comprising a steering system which provides a 360 degree rotatability about an axis substantially orthogonal to the axis of rotation of the wheels for translational movement of the vehicle (Column 5, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe by providing an emergency response fluid delivery tank as taught by Pestotnik to be able to fight fires in remote locations of a forest and providing a 360 degree rotatability for the front wheel as taught by Arnold for translational movement of the vehicle. The weight as recited in claim 75 is an obvious matter of design choice since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the weight of a component, which is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

13. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Fuller.

Art Unit: 3752

Fuller teaches a fire fighting vehicle comprising a frame 12 supporting a removable tank 16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Arnold by providing the recited limitations such the tank is removable from the vehicle since this concept is taught by Fuller in order to clean or replace the tank as necessary.

14. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Bolton et al.

Bolton et al. teaches providing fire resistant windows to vehicles for fire protection. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Arnold by providing a fire resistant window as taught by Bolton et al. for heat protection.

15. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Atkins.

Atkins teaches a vehicle having a chain and sprocket steering system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated into the vehicle of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Arnold a chain and sprocket steering system as taught by Atkins since Atkins teaches that such arrangements are known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3752

16. Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Fuller.

Fuller teaches a fire fighting vehicle comprising a frame 12 supporting a removable tank

16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Arnold by providing the recited limitations such the tank is removable from the vehicle since this concept is taught by Fuller in order to clean or replace the tank as necessary.

17. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Carrier.

Carrier teaches a fire fighting vehicle having a tank with fire-retarding chemicals which is capable of producing at least 34,000 liters of fire-suppressing foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Arnold by providing enough chemicals in order to produce at least 34,000 liters of foam as taught by Carrier in order to provide adequate amounts of fire fighting foam.

18. Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Forsyth.

Forsyth teaches a fire fighting vehicle which is capable of being airlifted to a destination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 3752

invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Kincheloe, Postotnik, and Arnold by providing at least one attachment point for airlifting and airdropping the vehicle as taught by Forsyth in order to quickly place the vehicle a particular location to fight fires.

19. Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Willard.

Willard, Jr. teaches a run-flat tire which demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and yet achieves the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe, Postotnik, and Arnold by using runflat tires as taught by Willard, Jr. in order to provide demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and achieve the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated.

20. Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Arnold as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of Matsushita.

Matsushita teaches a vehicle steering control system comprising left and right brakes and control valves for separately controlling the left and right brakes in order to obtain smooth turning performance. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Arnold by incorporating left and right brakes wherein the brakes are

Art Unit: 3752

separately controlled as taught by Matsushita in order to provide a smooth turning performance.

21. Claims 76, 78, 81, 84, 86, 90-92, and 112 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Matsushita.

Kincheloe discloses a vehicle comprising a triangular wheel base comprising a single front wheel and two opposing rear wheels, a vehicle engine, a wedge shaped nose, and at least one window. Pestotnik teaches a three wheeled fire-fighting vehicle comprising an emergency response fluid delivery tank to fight fires in remote forest locations and Matsushita teaches a vehicle steering control system comprising left and right brakes and control valves for separately controlling the left and right brakes in order to obtain smooth turning performance. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe by providing an emergency response fluid delivery tank as taught by Pestotnik to be able to fight fires in remote locations of a forest and incorporating left and right brakes wherein the brakes are separately controlled as taught by Matsushita in order to provide a smooth turning performance. The sizes as recited in claim 81 would have been obvious matters design choice. The weight recited in claim 92 would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on the desired weight of the vehicle.

22. Claims 77 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Fuller.

Art Unit: 3752

Fuller teaches a fire fighting vehicle comprising a frame 12 supporting a removable tank 16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Matsushita by providing the recited limitations such the tank is removable from the vehicle since this concept is taught by Fuller in order to clean or replace the tank as necessary.

23. Claim 79 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Bolton et al.

Bolton et al. teaches providing fire resistant windows to vehicles for fire protection. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Matsushita by providing a fire resistant window as taught by Bolton et al. for heat protection since the coating materials are often very hot when spread.

24. Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Atkins.

The patent to Atkins teaches a vehicle having a chain and sprocket steering system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated into the vehicle of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Matsushita a chain and sprocket steering system as taught by Atkins since Atkins teaches that such arrangements are known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3752

25. Claim 82 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Arnold.

Arnold teaches a vehicle comprising a steering system which provides a 360 degree rotatability about an axis substantially orthogonal to the axis of rotation of the wheels for translational movement of the vehicle (Column 5, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Matsushita by providing a 360 degree rotatability for the front wheel as taught by Arnold for translational movement of the vehicle.

26. Claim 85 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Carrier.

The patent to Carrier teaches a fire fighting vehicle having a tank with fire-retarding chemicals which is capable of producing at least 34,000 liters of fire-suppressing foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Matsushita by providing enough chemicals in order to produce at least 34,000 liters of foam as taught by Carrier in order to provide adequate amounts of fire fighting foam.

27. Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Forsyth.

Art Unit: 3752

Forsyth teaches a fire fighting vehicle which is capable of being airlifted to a destination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Matsushita by providing at least one attachment point for airlifting and airdropping the vehicle as taught by Forsyth in order to quickly place the vehicle at a particular location to fight fires.

28. Claim 88 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincheloe in view of Pestotnik and Matsushita as applied to claim 76 above, and further in view of Willard, Jr.

Willard, Jr. teaches a run-flat tire which demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and yet achieves the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Kincheloe, Pestotnik, and Matsushita by using runflat tires as taught by Willard, Jr. in order to provide demonstrates improved vehicle performance under deflated conditions and achieve the same vehicle performance as a standard tire when inflated.

Conclusion

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davis Hwu whose telephone number is 703-305-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

Art Unit: 3752

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y. Mar can be reached on (703)308-2087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Davis Hwu